UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2617th MEETING: 7 OCTOBER 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2617) 1

Adoption of the agenda 1

Complaint by Angola against South Africa:

Letter dated 1 October 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17510) 1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2617th MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 7 October 1985, at 4.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Vernon A. WALTERS
(United States of America).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2617)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. Complaint by Angola against South Africa:

   Letter dated 1 October 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17510)

The meeting was called to order at 5 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaint by Angola against South Africa:

Letter dated 1 October 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17510)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with decisions taken at the previous meetings on this item [*2612th, 2614th and 2616th meetings*], I invite the representative of Angola to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Botswana, Cameroon, Cuba, Ethiopia, Ghana, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kuwait, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Taleb Ibrahimi (Algeria), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Engo (Cameroon), Mr. Malmierca Peoli (Cuba), Mr. Wolde (Ethiopia), Mr. Asamoah (Ghana), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Alaoui (Morocco), Mr. dos Santos (Mozambique), Mr. Chamorro Mora (Nicaragua), Mr. Garba (Nigeria), Mr. Sarré (Senegal), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Bouziri (Tunisia), Mr. Al-Shaali (United Arab Emirates), Mr. Majengo (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia), Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) and Mr. Mangwende (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is the representative of Viet Nam. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

3. Mr. LE KIM CHUNG (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should first like to thank all the members of the Council for allowing my delegation to take part in the discussion of this item.

4. My delegation fully shares the concern of the international community in the light of the repeated acts of aggression that have since 1976 been perpetrated by the racist settlers of Pretoria against the People's Republic of Angola, and specifically the recent armed incursion carried out in Angola on 28 September.

5. Those who have spoken before me, particularly the representative of Angola, have already very eloquently and cogently emphasized the exceptional seriousness of this further act of aggression, which testifies obstinate arrogance of Pretoria and to the ignoble nature of the *apartheid* régime, and once again corroborates a view frequently expressed in the Security Council and on other occasions by distinguished statesmen such as the late Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the former Prime Minister of India and former Chairperson of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, namely, that the *apartheid* régime cannot be reformed but must be dismantled.

6. Perpetrated at a time when the anger of the South African people is even now violently shaking the very foundations of the abhorrent régime of *apartheid*, this new act of aggression against Angola demonstrates that Pretoria has, once again, preferred to resort to military adventurism against neighbouring front-line States in the vain hope of distracting international opinion from the distressing situation inside the country. Such arrogance also shows the calm confidence Pretoria comfortably enjoys from its protector and strategic North American ally.

7. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zimbabwe has already had occasion last week [*2614th meeting*] very pertinently to dot the i's and cross the t's on this subject when

he denounced in explicit terms the undoubted responsibility borne by those who stand on the side of these UNITA (National Union for the Total Independence of Angola) bandits who persist in trying desperately to topple the Government of the People's Republic of Angola.

8. The spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam has just made a statement in which he condemned the act of flagrant aggression committed by South Africa against Angola in the following terms:

> "This criminal act further demonstrates that the South African administration is still pursuing its policy of brazen aggression against the independence and sovereignty of Angola in gross contravention of international law, blatantly challenging public opinion in the African States, the non-aligned countries and peace-loving forces all over the world.
>
> "South Africa's act of aggression is also aimed at aiding the disintegrating UNITA reactionary henchmen in opposing the Angolan revolution and preventing support from the front-line States to the just struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO [*South West Africa People's Organization*].
>
> "The Vietnamese people and the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam strongly condemn this brazen act of aggression committed by the South African authorities against the People's Republic of Angola and firmly demand that they immediately halt this act and respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola.
>
> "The Vietnamese people once again reaffirm their militant solidarity with and full support for the fraternal Angolan people in their struggle against aggression and in defence of their countries."*

9. In the light of the new challenge that has been so brazenly hurled at the Security Council by the incorrigible and insolent racist régime of Pretoria, all the representatives who have spoken before me have vigorously raised their voices in indignation at the facts. My delegation wishes in turn to request the Council this time once and for all to be resolved to adopt appropriate and effective steps, including those provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter. At the same time it might be of some use to point out that it is not resolutions of the Council that are lacking. What the Council must do is to seek effective ways and means of implementing its resolutions. In this case, what must be done is to ensure that South Africa puts an end to its acts of aggression, immediately and unconditionally withdraw all its armed forces from Angolan territory and pay appropriate compensation for all the damage caused to the Angolan people.

10. My delegation believes that, echoing the universal condemnation of the new criminal act of Pretoria against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola, a firm and energetic stance by the Council is more than ever necessary in dealing with Pretoria in order finally to bring to reason those warmongers, who are staggering desperately under the mortal blows of the angered South African people and the legitimate wrath of humanity as a whole.

11. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Peter Mueshihange, Secretary for Foreign Relations of the South West Africa People's Organization, to whom the Council extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure at the 2614th meeting. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

12. Mr. MUESHIHANGE: Mr. President, I thank you and your colleagues of the Security Council for allowing me to participate in this important debate. I am particularly grateful to Comrade Léandre Bassolé, representative of Burkina Faso, for his timely initiative in facilitating my appearance before the Council.

13. I speak in the name of the oppressed but struggling Namibian people and the Central Committee of our movement to express the unflinching support and militant solidarity of SWAPO to the fraternal people and the Government of the People's Republic of Angola, which have come once again, for the third time within a short period of time, to lodge yet another complaint before the Council about a massive armed aggression launched by the racist Pretoria régime against their national territory.

14. Angola, a sovereign and independent country and a State Member of the United Nations, has known no peace since the victory of the revolution in 1975. The imperialists, the racists and their mercenary bands of Angolan traitors and those recruited abroad which are being directed by the *apartheid* régime in its continuing campaign of terror throughout southern Africa and beyond, have, over these many years, subjected Angola to all sorts of criminal acts which, in the language of the Charter of the United Nations, clearly constitute a serious threat to the peace, breach of the peace and aggression against that peaceful country.

15. Had it not been for the repeated abuse of the veto power by certain Western permanent members of the Council, aimed at protecting the racist rulers of the evil *apartheid* system and their own misguided economic interests in the region, the Security Council would long ago have imposed binding economic sanctions and other effective enforcement measures under the Charter, against racist South Africa to restore peace and security in and around Angola.

16. South Africa's record of crimes committed against the victims of its policies and practices have been catalogued and are well known to all. South Africa's record of defiance of the will of the international community, as reflected, for example, in the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations, and in particular the decisions of the Security Council, persists and is becoming worse with each

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

passing day. South Africa's stubborn refusal to implement the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, endorsed in resolution 435 (1978), remains a source of indignation. South Africa's bellicose attitude towards independent African States in any part of the continent and its hostile and expansionist tendencies directed specifically against the front-line States have provoked strong condemnations and demands for concerted and effective action to punish the Botha régime and his marauding henchmen.

17. In other words, the source of the conflict in our region is and has always been the evil system of *apartheid*, perpetuating itself at home by means of intensified repression, seeking, although in vain, to prevent the independence of Namibia by stationing more than 100,000 troops in our country, perpetrating repeated acts of aggression, destabilization and sabotage against the front-line States and other African States, particularly the People's Republic of Angola.

18. The racist spokesmen of the minority Pretoria régime had the audacity to tell the world that the reason for their latest armed aggression against the People's Republic of Angola was to carry out a pre-emptive military attack against SWAPO forces which, in their words, were preparing to attack the civilian population in Namibia. What a blatant lie. The racist Boers and their supporters have unsuccessfully tried to depict SWAPO as an enemy of the Namibian people. They have failed to convince anybody, certainly not the Namibian people, which continues to rally behind SWAPO and to provide the backbone of and ensure popular support for our movement, which expresses the unity and determination of our people in the struggle.

19. Now, of course, we all know the reason for the latest aggression against Angola. This reason was given on 20 September by the racist War Minister of Botha, namely, Magnus Malan. If ever there was any need for proof about Pretoria's active involvement with and direct military and other forms of support for renegade Savimbi and his mercenary bandits of UNITA, Malan has put it on record. He confirmed that the racist troops launched their military offensive emanating from Namibia—which they occupy illegally—as a rescue operation to bail out the bandits of UNITA. That was the reason, not the falsehoods and lies about SWAPO.

20. Needless to say, it is quite obvious who the criminal is. But let it be said once again that no amount of constant repetition of distortions, disinformation, name-calling and red-herrings will change the situation. *Apartheid* South Africa, which is public enemy number one of Africa and its people, cannot claim for itself the right to speak for the interests and security of the African people, making insulting utterances about "our continent" and "fellow Africans". The racists have made themselves the central problem facing Africa. Their actions remind us daily of this fact. Who gave them the right to speak for the masses of the African people, particularly the black people? They despise us, treating us like dogs, denying us our humanity and dignity, enslaving us in the land of our birth, monopolizing State power and economic benefits for a tiny white minority of the population in Namibia and in South Africa.

21. In a way, we understand their dilemma. The Pretoria racists, like their racist predecessors throughout history, are incurable victims of their own subjective conditioning based on an outrageous concept of human relations, not being able to see anything else except a master-servant relationship between different races. Botha and his henchmen are convinced until death that they know best what is good for Africa. They are also convinced that they are innocent victims of imaginary evil forces, at whose bidding Angola and, by extension, SWAPO are acting. In other words, the embattled Angolans, the oppressed Namibians and South Africans, the peaceful peoples of Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Botswana, Zambia, Lesotho, Swaziland, Seychelles and other African States are considered by them as perpetrators of certain crimes against the Boer régime.

22. We do not feel any empathy for the racists. They will certainly perish by their own sword if they refuse to adapt to the demands of the majority. Time is fast running out, and the African majority has virtually no more patience to spare. Blood is flowing. The vexing question is, how many rivers will it fill and in the end, how many people will have died?

23. During the earlier debates on Angola on 20 September, and again at the beginning of this debate, Botha's messenger expressed in the Council the view that "The United States Congress, by repealing the Clark Amendment, has already recognized the admissibility of aiding UNITA." [*2612th meeting, para. 31.*]

24. Are the Boers shooting in the dark, or are they letting the cat out of the bag? We know the history of the Clark Amendment and the widely reported imperialist conspiracy aimed at denying the Angolan people the fruits of their revolution. We have also learned from some official United States State Department documents that have been leaked in the past few years that there is a strong community of interests between Washington and Pretoria to see to it that the renegade Savimbi and his fellow traitors are not wiped out. Continuing public statements and comments by United States officials, who consider Savimbi and his cohorts as "freedom fighters," confirm the fact that there is an enduring interest in protecting Savimbi. Of course, the larger framework for pursuing this campaign is the widely condemned policy of "constructive engagement," together with its notorious offshoot, "linkage".

25. It was not too long ago that a group of reactionaries and counter-revolutionaries from Africa, Asia and Latin America were brought together in southern Angola at a secret meeting by the racists and their friends, with the blessing of none other than the President of the United States. At the end of the jamboree something called a "Democratic International" was formed to serve the interests of international imperialism, *apartheid* and colonialism.

26. I know some people do not like us to point out these things. I also expect that we will face even more problems and official harassment. The reason why we say these

things is that the independence of our country is held at ransom and our people are forced to continue to suffer owing to the fact that the legitimate struggle of our people, which is now 101 years old, has been turned into an aspect of the East/West conflict. How can we afford to be quiet in such a situation?

27. The Botha régime is treating the Security Council with utter contempt. Pretoria and its friends are only too quick to call for free elections as long as they are not in occupied Namibia and *apartheid* South Africa itself. This is sheer hypocrisy and insincerity. The so-called draft resolution submitted by Botha's messenger is an insult to the Council. It must be rejected and thrown into a dustbin, where it belongs.

28. There is a similar pattern of behaviour, that of arrogance, cynicism and bellicosity, which characterizes the two racist States, *apartheid* South Africa and Zionist Israel. The intermittent debates resulting from the complaints lodged by the aggressed African countries, Angola and Tunisia, amply attest to this identical behaviour by the two pariah States in the Middle East and in southern Africa.

29. The Council is faced with an unprecedented challenge, as one speaker after another has pointed out. Now is the time for the Council to respond promptly and in an appropriate manner consistent with its primary responsibilities to restore peace and security in the respective regions and to pave the way for the total emancipation of the oppressed peoples of Namibia, South Africa and Palestine.

30. Your leadership, Mr. President, your reputed diplomatic skills and much-needed objectivity, should serve to guide the Council towards assuming its responsibilities fully in the service of humanity, for liberation, justice and peace, sooner rather than later.

31. The struggle continues! Victory is certain!

32. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Nicaragua. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

33. Mr. CHAMORRO MORA (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Scarcely a week had gone by in this month of October commemorative of the founding of the Organization than the Security Council was convened at the request of two Member States to denounce barbarous acts of aggression that violate the most fundamental principles of international law and constitute serious threats to international peace and security.

34. On both occasions—and even before the Council had taken action on the issues—we heard the defendants not only impugn the Council but also cynically make a mockery of any decisions that might be taken and declare that the acts of aggression they have committed are legitimate and justifiable.

35. We have heard many small countries like our own state in this body that they come to the Council because it is the sole means they have of seeking some concrete action from the international community to halt aggression by the powerful.

36. Our colleague and brother the representative of the People's Republic of Angola has told us that since 1976 his people and Government have been appearing before the Council to denounce aggression and that they would continue to do so and to call for action by the Council because that was their right, just as it was the Council's responsibility to take concrete action that could bring an end to aggressions.

37. How will the Council respond on this occasion to the fraternal people and Government of Angola? The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, which includes the majority of the international community, has already responded. We have not only repeatedly taken a stand in this connection; we have also taken measures on an individual basis, measures that have obviously not been enough, because it is clear that it is not we non-aligned that are contributing to the economic, military and nuclear strength of the racist Pretoria régime.

38. We regret that in this commemorative year of the Organization, a year in which we should be taking the last steps towards the independence of Namibia and the total elimination of the odious system of *apartheid*, what we see, unfortunately, is more aggression by South Africa against Angola and the front-line States, more intransigence and refusals to implement resolution 435 (1978) and more actions committed with impunity by South Africa as a result of the continued collaboration of a permanent member of this Council through its insistence on maintaining the policy of constructive engagement.

39. The responsibility is in the hands of the Council, and primarily in the hands of its permanent members. The members of the Council have the floor.

40. On 20 June of this year, the Council considered the complaint of Angola on an incursion into the province of Cabinda in Angola. On that occasion, the Council adopted resolution 567 (1985), condemning South Africa for those acts and demanding the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all South African troops from Angolan territory.

41. Just two weeks ago, we once again heard here a statement by the representative of Angola, who denounced another massive invasion by South African troops, supported by bombing carried out by South African Mirage jets, in the Angolan provinces of Cunene, Cuando-Cubango and Moxico, 275 kilometres north of the Namibian border and 180 kilometres from the Zambian border. At that time, the Council adopted resolution 571 (1985), through which it "Strongly condemns the racist régime of South Africa for its premeditated, persistent and sustained armed invasions of the People's Republic of Angola". Furthermore, the Council strongly condemned

South Africa for its use of Namibia, an illegally occupied Territory, as a springboard for these armed invasions and for the third time demanded that that country immediately and unconditionally withdraw all its troops from Angolan territory and that it put an end to these acts of aggression.

42. There has not even been time to implement the mandate contained in this most recent resolution—that is, to send to Angola a commission of investigation composed of three members of this Council to evaluate the damage resulting from the aggression—when once again we are compelled to meet. Just a few days ago, on 3 October [*2612th meeting*], we heard another complaint by the representative of Angola on further air attacks committed by South African planes on the town of Mavinga, 250 kilometres from the Namibian border in Angolan territory, causing 65 deaths and wounding hundreds more. This new and brutal act of aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola is characteristic of the way that the South African régime usually responds to the resolutions adopted by the Council.

43. The constant acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola are aimed at containing the offensive launched by the FAPLA (People's Armed Forces for the Liberation of Angola) troops against the UNITA mercenaries deployed in the south of its territory and at distracting the international community's attention from the killings and mass imprisonments carried out by the racist régime of South Africa against the black South African population, which is involved in a growing and indomitable struggle that will ultimately put an end to the odious system of *apartheid*. They are, moreover, as we have already said, a proof of the arrogance and disdain with which Pretoria responds to the Council and its decisions.

44. How many times more will Angola have to appear before the Security Council to denounce the acts of aggression of which it is a victim? How many times more will the Council deplore these unjustifiable acts of aggression and adopt resolutions that are defiantly disobeyed? When will the so-called policy of constructive engagement be put aside, as its only results have been the escalation of aggression and of force, the institutionalization of *apartheid* and the massacre of the South African population, the prolongation of the illegal occupation of Namibia, the intensification of acts of aggression and the sowing of death and destruction among the Angolan population?

45. We welcome the unilateral measures that have been taken by a series of countries to increase pressure on South Africa, but we believe that this is not enough. We have had enough of mere reprimands and advice, enough of minor punishments for a party that is nothing but a blind and maddened monster, cornered today by the indomitable thrust of history and the struggle of peoples for freedom and justice.

46. It is necessary that the Council, doing honour to the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, honour to its responsibilities under the Charter, honour to the solemn commitments expressed through its verbal declarations, now demand an immediate cessation of any direct or indirect intervention in the internal affairs of Angola and the other front-line States by South Africa and its powerful allies; condemn the illegal occupation of Namibia and demand the immediate and unconditional implementation of resolution 435 (1978); strongly condemn the policy of "constructive engagement" of the Government of the United States and demand that it be abandoned; unequivocally condemn South Africa and take immediate action in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter in order to celebrate, together with the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the fortieth anniversary with its theme "United Nations for a better world"—in other words, a world which has completely eliminated the odious régime of *apartheid*.

47. We reiterate the need to give all due attention to the complaint of the fraternal people and Government of Angola. We wish to convey to the Council the feelings of our countries as expressed in the Final Political Declaration [*see S/17610 and Corr.1, annex I*] of the ministerial Conference held at Luanda in September 1985 and, especially, as expressed in the special communiqué of that meeting on the situation in South Africa [*ibid*]. We hope that the Council will add its voice in full support of the demand of the majority of the international community .

48. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ghana, Mr. Obed Asamoah, whom I welcome. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

49. Mr. ASAMOAH (Ghana): May I first extend to you, Sir, my sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of October. I have no doubt that the Council and the United Nations as a whole will reap lasting benefit during your tenure of office from your wisdom and wide experience.

50. I should also like to take this opportunity to express the appreciation of my delegation to Sir John Thomson, the representative of the United Kingdom, for the able manner in which he, and also the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Sir Geoffrey Howe, conducted the affairs of the Council during September.

51. The Government and people of Ghana are profoundly shocked by South Africa's brazen arrogance and continued defiance of the Security Council. Only two weeks ago the Council met and unanimously adopted resolution 571 (1985) condemning South Africa for its flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola. At the very least one would have expected South Africa to respect the unanimous decision of the Council. But quite the contrary has happened. South Africa has not only paid no heed, but has continued to commit further acts of aggression against Angola in flagrant violation of international law, thus posing a serious threat to international peace and security. In doing so, it is undermining basic principles of the Charter, and those who support South Africa are encouraging international anarchy. The present act of aggression confirms that the racist régime is

an international outlaw prepared to indulge in State terrorism against its peaceful neighbours.

52. My delegation is left in no doubt that the recent dastardly act was committed by South Africa in an attempt to shore up the bandit forces of Jonas Savimbi, which have been on the retreat from the legitimate offensive recently launched against them by the Angolan Government. To those who support Savimbi we say that he is a puppet; he compromises the dignity of Africans and the black man everywhere, and he is an outlaw whom all Africans must fight against. Those who extol the virtues of UNITA in the name of the much abused word "democracy" only want to introduce a Trojan horse in the midst of Africa's struggle for true independence, dignity and respect. No matter what interpretation is given to the recent history of Africa, Ghana accepts the MPLA (People's Liberation Movement of Angola) as a true nationalist movement and the present Government as the legitimate Government of Angola.

53. As I said earlier, this is not the first time racist South Africa has attacked Angolan territory, leading to the loss of life, and, in keeping with its character of bigotry and contempt for the black man, it will most likely repeat the same barbarous acts in the future. The Council, in the discharge of its obligations under the Charter, must not appear helpless in the face of such violation of international law and contempt for values shared by the vast majority of mankind. The members of the Council have a duty to posterity to sacrifice parochial interests for a harmonious future. The Council must fulfil its mandate and maintain its credibility by the use of the appropriate provisions of the Charter to maintain international peace and security in that part of the world. In that regard, Articles 41 and 42 of the Charter, which provide measures a step short of the use of armed force, are appropriate to underscore firmly the determination of the international community not to condone the continuous acts of armed terror and carnage by South Africa against neighbouring countries, especially Angola.

54. On 3 October [*2612th meeting*], we heard a surprising statement from the representative of South Africa. First, he accused the Council of fomenting violence in Angola by appealing, in resolution 571 (1985), to Member States to assist Angola in the defence of its territorial integrity. One would want to know from the South Africans why it should be necessary for anyone to do that if the Government and people of Angola were left alone to live in peace. Who, may we ask, is arming and training Savimbi's criminal gang to kill and maim innocent civilians in Angola? Who sent a commando group into Angola in an aborted attempt to blow up oil installations in Cabinda Province? And who has twice in less than a fortnight invaded Angolan territory and violated its sovereignty? In the face of these blatant acts of aggression by South Africa against Angola, can anyone legitimately deny Angola its right to defend its sovereignty and to receive assistance for that purpose from whatever source it desires?

55. Some influential members of the Council have the habit of describing South Africa's acts of aggression against Angola and other front-line States as mere "cross-border violence". Surely the time has come for even those members to see in South Africa's actions a deliberate and systematic pattern of aggression calculated to destabilize Angola and to destroy its economic infrastructure.

56. It is time for all members of the Council to recognize without equivocation that South Africa is engaged in nothing but gross and blatant acts of aggression in defence of its colonial stranglehold on Namibia and the doctrine of the supremacy of the whites, a doctrine that brings to mind nazism and the untold misery that Hitler—who was, incidentally, admired by the Afrikaners—brought upon mankind. It cannot, we hope, be claimed by even South Africa's most ardent defenders that their objective in instituting the discredited constructive engagement policy was to give South Africa that licence to engage at will and with impunity in so-called cross-border violence. Yet that is what that policy has produced; it has engendered in South Africa an aggressive arrogance paralleled in our present-day world only by the expansionist violence and terrorism practised by Israel against its neighbours in the Middle East, of which the peace-loving people of Tunisia and their Palestinian guests are the latest victims.

57. The second point I want to raise in connection with the statement made in this Chamber by the South African representative is this: since he claims that "South Africa is committed to peace and stability in southern Africa" [*ibid., para. 32*], does he mean to tell the Council that South Africa's continued acts of aggression and destabilization are in keeping with that objective?

58. I have pondered over the statement made by the South African representative in an effort to find one shred of good sense, an iota of justification for his country's present invasion of Angola. I have found none. This latest South African aggression has been committed not because of the standard Pretoria excuse of infiltration by SWAPO into Namibia, but quite simply, as has been the objective all along, to support puppets that will assist in the preservation of *apartheid*. The call for the withdrawal of foreign forces from Angola is intended to conjure up the spectre of communism in southern Africa for the benefit of those who think communism represents evil. Such propaganda does not impress us. For the African, the socialist countries have been a vital factor in the liberation process, while the so-called democracies only exhibit bigotry and want every opportunity to exploit. Their conversion to the liberation process, where that has been the case, has been involuntary and grudging.

59. It is the view of my Government that the Council should not allow itself to be fooled by this vile propaganda campaign by South Africa and its supporters to discredit the Government of Angola, whose only desire, like that of the rest of Africa, is to be left in peace to develop its resources for the benefit of its people in true freedom and independence and not as a vassal or dependency of racist South Africa. We call on the Council not to prevaricate and waver this time. The fact of South Africa's aggression against Angola is clear and incontestable. It demands an appropriate and effective response from the Council, a

response which should not fall short of the immediate imposition of comprehensive and mandatory economic sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. The Council should also request South Africa to withdraw forthwith all its occupation forces from every inch of Angolan territory and give an undertaking not to commit any further acts of aggression against Angola, as well as to respect scrupulously Angola's sovereignty and territorial integrity. The Council should also request South Africa to pay appropriate compensation for the human and material damage it has caused in Angola.

60. In this fortieth anniversary year of the United Nations, my delegation would like to urge the Council to reflect on the consequences of its weaknesses in the past and resolve to enhance its authority in the future as intended by the Charter.

61. In conclusion, allow me to convey the sincere sympathy and condolences of the Government and people of Ghana to the Government and people of Angola in this hour of tragedy. We shall be prepared to play our part in defence of Angola if called upon to do so. We hope that the international community will assist with the necessary resources to enable Angola to recover quickly from the consequences of continued South African aggression.

62. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Botswana. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

63. Mr. LEGWAILA (Botswana): You can be sure that we are very much encouraged, Sir, to see so eminent a person in the chair of the presidency of the Security Council in a month that already promises to be very difficult indeed. You have both our congratulations and our commiseration. We have no reason whatsoever to doubt that you are more than equal to the tasks that lie ahead.

64. With consummate skill your predecessor guided the deliberations of the Council last month. We congratulate him and the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom, Sir Geoffrey Howe, for a job well done.

65. It is a little more than two weeks since the Security Council demanded by its resolution 571 (1985) the withdrawal of South African troops from Angola. There would not even have been time for that resolution to be implemented, and yet we find ourselves back at the Council in an atmosphere of heightening crisis to discuss once again the brutal violation by South Africa of Angola's territorial integrity and national sovereignty. Once again South Africa has demonstrated unashamedly what a rogue elephant it has turned itself into. That it has never at any time in the past shown any respect for the decisions of the Council is a painful and frustrating fact we all know only too well, but that it has grown accustomed to showing that disrespect with such wanton exuberance is an ominous development which the Council can ignore only at great peril to peace and stability in southern Africa.

66. We have said on numerous occasions before, and we say now, that the problem in southern Africa today is not the presence of Cuban forces in Angola but the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and the pestilence of *apartheid* and racial tyranny in South Africa. Not only that: Cuban forces in Angola, about which Pretoria has been raving and ranting so pretentiously in the past few years, are in Angola because of South Africa's thwarted attempt to destroy the People's Republic of Angola at birth. If South Africa had not invaded a nascent Angola in 1975, there would have been no Cuban forces in Angola to rant and rave about. But the fact that they are there does not give South Africa or anybody else the right to violate Angola's territorial integrity. South Africa has never produced evidence—not a shred of evidence—to show how the presence of Cuban forces is a threat to its security. Angola does not share a border with South Africa. Between the two countries lies a vast country called Namibia, which is in no way, form or shape part of South Africa. No Cuban soldier has ever set foot on Namibia, let alone gone anywhere near South Africa.

67. So we ask: Why these repeated violations of Angola's territorial integrity, the massacre of innocent refugees resident in that country, the wanton destruction of economic infrastructure, and the senseless mass murder of Angolan civilians? Why?

68. Just imagine the cynicism with which the deliberations of this Council are regarded by a country whose evil policies would shame even the devil himself. The other day the Council was treated to a charade in the form of a draft resolution [*S/17522*], all of whose operative paragraphs cry for implementation by Pretoria itself. Cuban troops are in Angola by invitation. South African troops are not. Cuban troops are not violating the territorial integrity of Angola. South African troops are. In any case, what right does South Africa have to teach Angola lessons in political righteousness and constitutional probity? Is it not South Africa itself which must learn all these lessons in order that it can at long last be rehabilitated into the comity of free and civiiized nations?

69. It is in South Africa, more than anywhere else in our region, that operative paragraph 3 of South Africa's cynical draft resolution must be implemented without delay; for there is in that country today not simply a polarization of factions feuding about political differences but a very serious situation whose likely consequences we shudder to contemplate. For, even as we sit here debating South Africa's wanton aggression against Angola, the very same South Africa is busy murdering its own black citizens, whose only crime, if crime it is, is to agitate peacefully for the restoration of their right to self-determination—a right which South Africa denies with brutal tyranny and yet has the nerve to try to teach others to respect.

70. No moral lessons can be learned from an immoral racial tyranny. The people of Angola, like any other free people, have chosen a political path which is theirs alone, whether South Africa or anyone else likes it or not. At least Angola does not murder its own citizens for their love of freedom. South Africa does so daily, as the past year has shown. So there is absolutely nothing of positive and

moral substance that South Africa can teach Angola. The Security Council should therefore reject with the contempt it deserves South Africa's draft resolution, which is nothing but an insult to the Council's intelligence.

71. Southern Africa wants peace, not the sort of madness we are witnessing today in South Africa and the region at large. For peace to prevail in the region, the madness must end. South Africa must learn to respect the right of its neighbours to be themselves, to organize their own lives in accordance with their own social and political values and to choose friends and identify enemies as they please, so long as the peace and stability of the region are not disturbed.

72. Indeed, none of the free countries of the region is responsible for the bloody strife so commonplace in that part of the world today. The undeniable fact is that the rulers of South Africa have singlehandedly transformed our region into a veritable cockpit of conflict. Maddened by racial bigotry and a blind determination to preserve *apartheid* and racism in our sub-continent at all costs, they seem also to be irredeemably committed to reducing the region to scorched earth. No, the source of conflict in our region is not the presence of Cuban troops in Angola or the granting of political asylum to South African refugees by South Africa's neighbours. It is the pestilence of *apartheid* and racism in South Africa. It is the denial of the right of self-determination to the people of Namibia. It is acts of aggression such as those that are being committed by South Africa with such sickening regularity against Angola and other front-line States. It is the sort of racial arrogance and bad faith that have become so much of an article of faith in Pretoria.

73. We must ask, what about the spawning of dissident movements everywhere in the region? All roads to dissident camps in Mozambique and Angola begin in Pretoria. South Africa, as we all know, also hosts the so-called Lesotho Liberation Army, a motley of murderous dissidents whose pernicious aim is to destabilize and, if they can, overthrow the legitimate Government of the Kingdom of Lesotho. The Council knows only too well of the havoc the marauding dissidents in our region have wreaked, not only on the economic infrastructure of the countries concerned but on human life as well. Not even a momentous accord such as the Nkomati accord [*S/16451 of 30 March 1984, annex I*] has been able to restrain South Africa's madness. The racist régime in Pretoria implacably remains the godfather of the dissident movements in the region. It has confessed to being so only recently.

74. Incredibly, even as the Council prepares to conclude this debate on South Africa's aggression against the People's Republic of Angola, I received news this morning to the effect that another State in the region is under attack by South Africa. I am told that about 10 o'clock last night, bazookas were fired into Lesotho from South African territory by people identified as soldiers by their military uniforms. What has Lesotho done to warrant such aggression? Is it not more than enough that this small peace-loving country is not only land-locked but also finds itself in the geographical position of having to shape a destiny in the belly of vicious tyranny?

75. In the final analysis, *apartheid* is far beyond redemption. Its evil genius belongs to an antedeluvian era and must soon face the flood of black nationalism and the consuming fury of its frustrated aspirations. The end is near. The question is no longer when *apartheid* and racial tyranny will end in South Africa, but how. To date, all signs point to a ghastly demise for that evil system, for the system can be neither reformed nor improved. There is no such thing as reformed or improved evil. Only from the ashes of *apartheid* and racial tyranny can the people of South Africa—all of them, regardless of race, colour or creed—build a new South Africa and fulfil their calling in peace, freedom and justice.

76. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Tunisia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

77. Mr. BOUZIRI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): First of all, Sir, allow me to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council and to wish you every success. You have demonstrated remarkable authority and great wisdom in your guidance of the work of the Council.

78. I wish also to convey my congratulations to Sir John Thomson, representative of the United Kingdom, who demonstrated a subtle intelligence and great ability as President of the Council last month.

79. I am speaking today to affirm Tunisia's solidarity with Angola, a fraternal, friendly African country which, like Tunisia, fell victim last week to armed foreign aggression. I convey to the Angolan people the shock and the deep condolences of the Tunisian people.

80. On 28 September 1985, South African aircraft, with utter scorn for the norms of international law, carried out a lethal raid 250 kilometres inside the Angolan border. That attack by the Pretoria armed forces was launched only eight days after the Security Council had strongly condemned the racist régime of South Africa for its "premeditated, persistent and sustained armed invasions" of Angola, which constitute a flagrant violation of its sovereignty and territorial integrity and causing a considerable loss of human life. It is thus that South Africa responded to resolution 571 (1985) of 20 September which demanded that it withdraw forthwith and unconditionally all its military forces from the territory of Angola. By its action, Pretoria has once again demonstrated to the international community its contempt for the United Nations body with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Thus, the Security Council is considering for the third time this year a complaint by Angola about South African armed incursions into its territory.

81. In this connection, it would be appropriate to note that the Pretoria régime is all the more worthy of condem-

nation as it is launching these armed attacks from Namibia, a Territory it occupies illegally. Apart from its aggression against Angola, that régime has constantly defied the various United Nations resolutions calling upon it to put an immediate, unconditional end to its illegal occupation of that Territory and to grant the Namibian people its right of self-determination and independence.

82. However, despite the near-immunity it enjoys at present, South Africa must understand once and for all that its policy of out and out aggression against the countries of the region, particularly Angola, can not supply it with an appropriate framework for it to set up at Windhoek a constitutional and political system that would enable it to perpetuate its colonial domination over Namibia and to delay self-determination and independence indefinitely.

83. At this point I should like to take the opportunity to quote some passages from the statement made by Mr. Habib Bourguiba, President of the Republic of Tunisia, when commemorating Namibia Day last August. He said:

> "Tunisia finds it intolerable that at a time when the United Nations is about to celebrate its fortieth anniversary there should still remain in existence the aberration constituted by the occupation of Namibia by racist South Africa. South Africa's tactics of aggression and repression—which we once again condemn—cannot delay indefinitely the attainment of independence by the Namibian people. In this regard, Tunisia feels that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the cornerstone and the sole valid framework for any just and lasting settlement of the Namibian problem."[1]

84. Nevertheless it transpires that the armed incursions of South Africa into Angola are not simply designed to compromise the independence of Namibia but also, and this has become quite obvious, to distract the attention of international public opinion from the deteriorating situation in South Africa as a result of the progressive and inexorable break-up of the odious régime of *apartheid*.

85. Tunisia cannot but condemn the Pretoria régime for its armed aggressions against Angola, which are irrefutable proof that Pretoria is, today as yesterday, not prepared to conform with international law. Numerous appeals have been made, numerous condemnations have been meted out to it by the Security Council, but to no avail. Consequently it is time for the Council to take the necessary effective steps by acting decisively to induce the racist South African régime to put an end to its armed attacks against Angola and to grant independence to Namibia, in accordance with its resolution 435 (1978).

86. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Morocco. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

87. Mr. ALAOUI (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, may I first of all personally discharge the pleasant duty of telling you how pleased we are to see you presiding over the work of the Security Council for October and of congratulating your predecessor, Sir John Thomson, for the skilful and competent way in which he conducted the work of the Council last month.

88. I should also like to thank the members of the Council for giving me this opportunity to express our solidarity with the People's Republic of Angola.

89. Just two weeks ago the Council adopted resolution 571 (1985), demanding that South Africa immediately and unconditionally withdraw its military forces from Angola, cease all acts of aggression against that State and scrupulously respect its sovereignty territorial integrity. Today the Council is convened once again to consider one more unjustified act of aggression, a premeditated act by the Government of South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola.

90. The facts presented by the representative of the People's Republic of Angola at the beginning of this debate are overwhelming and speak for themselves. The South African air force deliberately violated Angolan airspace and bombed the Mavinga region, killing over 65 persons and leaving hundreds wounded.

91. Thus, in spite of universal repudiation and repeated condemnation by the Security Council, South Africa continues to treat with contempt the territorial integrity of a sovereign State, a Member of the Organization, and uses every possible pretext to strengthen its policy of hegemony in the region. The persistence with which the Pretoria Government defies the international community and endangers the peace and security of neighbouring States inevitably recalls the policy of aggression and expansion of Israel, whose raid on Tunisia was unequivocally condemned by the Council.

92. Unfortunately, such acts may well recur if the Organization does not tackle the roots of the evil by compelling South Africa to repudiate its degrading policy of *apartheid* and if it does not, put an end, through the adoption of appropriate measures, to the illegal presence of the racist régime in Namibia, whose territory has once again been used to launch this most recent act of aggression against Angola.

93. The Kingdom of Morocco energetically denounces and condemns this further act of brazen violence and calls upon the Council to take decisive, energetic action to put an end to South Africa's violations of the sovereignty of neighbouring countries and its flagrant breaches of international peace and security.

94. I should also like to express to my colleague and friend the representative of Angola the sympathy and solidarity of Morocco in this trying situation and to reaffirm our constant support for the defence of the territorial integrity of Angola.

95. The support that Angola and the other front-line States are unceasingly giving to the struggle of the Na-

mibian people and to the oppressed masses of South Africa places a heavy burden on those States, and thus they require united and supportive action by the Organization to safeguard their territorial integrity and to reaffirm the trust they place in the United Nations and in its role in the defence of international peace and security wherever they are threatened.

96. It is the duty of the Security Council to respond positively to the expectations of the peoples of southern Africa and the entire international community by taking the necessary measures to prevent any recurrence of action by South Africa against the peaceful States of the region.

97. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Mfanafuthi Makatini, to whom the Council extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure at the 2616th meeting. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

98. Mr. MAKATINI: Mr. President, I sincerely thank you and all the members of the Council for giving us the opportunity to add the voice of the African National Congress to those that in unison in this chamber and around the world have strongly condemned the Pretoria régime for the latest unprovoked, premeditated and dastardly act of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola.

99. Allow us also to congratulate you, Sir, on the assumption of the presidency of the Council during this important month of October and to pay tribute to your predecessor, Sir John Thomson, for his outstanding performance.

100. Several speakers who have preceded us have stressed that racist South Africa's latest act of aggression against Angola was launched even before the ink was dry on resolution 571 (1985) in which, *inter alia*, the Council reiterates the demand that South Africa withdraw forthwith and unconditionally all its military forces from the territory of the People's Republic of Angola, cease all acts of aggression against that State and scrupulously respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola.

101. The African National Congress fully shares the view expressed by the representative of India, that the Council's response to the Pretoria régime's arrogant defiance should be "unequivocal condemnation . . . and unanimous and swift action to make it comply with its Charter obligations". [*2612th meeting, para. 22.*]

102. Recently the Pretoria régime put the world on notice that it was brazenly determined to defy the Council by rejecting in advance any decisions that emerged from its deliberations. This attitude was again underscored in the statement made here by Pretoria's spokesman last Thursday. On that occasion, the representative of the South African régime had the temerity to use this Council chamber as a podium from which to pronounce bellicose threats against the front-line and neighbouring States. He again repeated Pretoria's claim arrogating to itself the right to intervene militarily in all African countries.

103. It is evident to us that the *apartheid* régime has been emboldened by the knowledge that, whatever else the international community might say, effective action to make Pretoria comply has been repeatedly blocked by some permanent members of the Council, especially the United States. It is time that Pretoria's friends and allies realized that they will have to share responsibility with that régime as long as they maintain this universally condemned course of action.

104. There can be no double standards on questions of international law and morality. Aggression must not be seen as permissible for the Pretoria régime because it enjoys the favour of certain Governments. Appeasement has never proved a formula for deterring aggression. History and the events that led to the creation of this Organization teach us that.

105. The Pretoria régime has shamelessly proclaimed that it has consistently violated every article of the solemn undertakings it made at Nkomati in 1984; it openly declares that it finances, equips and maintains a bandit army inside Angola; indeed, it claims the right to perpetrate such criminal actions in any country in southern Africa if that State does not comply with its dictates.

106. Pretoria's war of aggression in the region finds its parallel in the murderous repression of our people inside South Africa. the unrepented intransigence of this régime underlines the correctness of the non-aligned countries' determination that there will never be peace, security and stability in southern Africa until the entire *apartheid* system is uprooted and replaced by a democratic system of government based on the will of all South Africans.

107. We are confident that the mendacious draft resolution proposed by the representative of the Pretoria régime will be treated by the Council with the contempt it deserves. Like its diabolical actions, the words of Pretoria bespeak its arrogant contempt for the rest of humanity.

108. Alarmed at the international ground-swell against racist minority rule and in favour of sanctions, as well as the ever-growing strength of the mass democratic movement inside our country, the régime seeks to embroil the region in war as a means of purchasing a longer lease of life. There could be no more fitting way of marking the fortieth anniversary of the defeat of fascism and the founding of the United Nations than by the Security Council's imposing against racist South Africa comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

109. The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers, and I shall now speak in my capacity as representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA in exercise of the right of reply.

110. Once again I have listened to a litany of one-sided and mendacious accusations against my country describing it as supplying "aid and comfort" to the Republic of South Africa and even of supplying arms to that country. I would remind the Council and the invited speakers that the United States placed an embargo on the sales of arms to the Republic of South Africa many years before the United Nations did. This is a well-known fact clearly ignored by a number of the speakers here today.

111. I was frankly astonished to hear the representative of Viet Nam express his horror over aggression against neighbouring States. He is particularly qualified to speak on this matter. His country has many thousands of troops in a neighbouring country supporting a puppet régime, and, as he does this, he is receiving "aid and comfort" from the member of the Council.

112. People are not fleeing from my country; they are clamouring to get into this nest of imperialism, and that speaks for itself.

113. I shall now resume my function as PRESIDENT of the Council.

114. It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution submitted by Burkina Faso, Egypt, India, Madagascar, Peru and Trinidad and Tobago [*S/17531*]. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

115. As the representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, I request that a separate vote be taken on operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution.

116. I resume my function as PRESIDENT of the Council.

117. If I hear no objection, I shall first put operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Against: None.

Abstaining: United States of America.

Operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

118. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put the draft resolution as a whole to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously [resolution 574 (1985)].

119. The PRESIDENT: I shall now make a statement as the representative of the United States in connection with the vote.

120. Once again, we find ourselves gathered around this table to consider a violation of the integrity of Angola's borders. Once again, I shall set forth United States policy towards South African operations of this sort. We condemn them. They serve to exacerbate an already volatile situation. Besides their negative consequences on chances for a negotiated solution to the problems besetting the region, they cause misery and death. So long as they continue they will frustrate the aspirations of all those in southern Africa longing to enjoy their simple, inalienable right to a life without war and bloodshed.

121. The diplomacy of the United States in the region is geared to peaceful, negotiated solutions. It is the road to a deeper and more lasting settlement than gunpowder can ever offer. My Government asks all parties to recognize the folly of this strife. They should realize the necessity of turning back forthwith, in their own interests, to the negotiating track.

122. There is a clear and unmistakable contrast between this policy of negotiation—supported without reservations by my Government—and the policy of certain forces outside the region which fuel the conflict in the benighted belief that their own interests are served. Why do these distant forces fear peaceful negotiations among the parties involved, unless for self-serving reasons? Theirs is a selfish and myopic policy. It leads ineluctably to more bloodletting for the Angolans, more hardship for civilians which have been so long under the yoke of Mars. And it is a devious policy that feigns concern for the interests of the Angolans, that distorts realities to serve its own expansionist goals and that, under the guise of disinterest, has a clear mission for the region which does not incorporate the hopes of all for peace, freedom and security.

123. My delegation welcomes this resolution as an occasion to reiterate our call for an immediate withdrawal of South African troops from Angola. We join once again all members of the Council in deploring this latest incursion.

124. But, as I stated a little over two weeks ago, my Government believes that the introduction of more weapons of war into the area will result in an escalation of violence, more deaths, more misery. Angola needs peace, not more foreign troops, foreign intervention and imported arms.

125. The United States supports the territorial integrity of Angola. We call on South Africa, yet again, to halt further acts of aggression. We could not, however, vote in favour of paragraph 6 for the same reason that we could not vote in favour of a similar call to arms in resolution 571 (1985). For that reason my delegation abstained in the

voting on paragraph 6. Since the rest of the resolution was acceptable to us, I had no hesitation in voting for it.

126. I now resume my function as PRESIDENT of the Council.

127. I call on the representative of the United Kingdom, who wishes to make a statement following the voting.

128. Mr. MAXEY (United Kingdom): I must once again pay a tribute to the representative of Angola for the way in which he has helped the Council to reach a unanimous position.

129. The unanimous adoption of resolution 574 (1985), like the unanimous vote on 20 September for resolution 571 (1985), is of the greatest importance in demonstrating the total inadmissibility of South Africa's attacks upon Angola. The South African Government would be well advised to heed the unanimous demands of the Council.

130. The United Kingdom wishes to see an immediate end to the fighting within Angola and the beginning of reconciliation and reconstruction after years of conflict there. Lest there be any ambiguity about the present resolution, I would refer to the statement made in the Council on 20 September by Sir John Thomson [*2607th meeting*]. The United Kingdom does not interpret paragraph 6 of the resolution as endorsing the intervention of foreign combat troops. We would like to see all foreign forces withdrawn from Angola as soon as possible.

131. The Security Council has an important role to play in keeping the situation in Angola under close review and in promoting efforts to build peace there. In this connection I trust that the Commission of Investigation established under resolution 571 (1985) will soon be in a position to visit Angola and report back to the Council. Their assessment will be of considerable value to us all.

132. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Angola has asked to make a statement, and I call upon him.

133. Mr. DE FIGUEIREDO (Angola): On behalf of my delegation, I would like to thank the Council for the effort it has put into the meetings called at the request of the Government of the People's Republic of Angola once again to draw international attention to the most recent violations of the Charter of the United Nations by the outcasts of the international community, the racist *apartheid* régime of South Africa.

134. The representative of the racist minority régime—a régime guilty of the most terrible violation of the most fundamental rights inside South Africa itself, a régime which is in illegal occupation of a Territory under the administration of the United Nations, a régime guilty of violations of international law, a régime which invades the territory of neighbouring sovereign States, a régime which even as we meet has its troops entrenched on the soil of Angola—the representative of that régime refers to "democratic countries" [*2612th meeting, para. 25*]. What would he or his régime know of democracy when *apartheid* is its very antithesis? What would he or his régime know of "true Africans" [*ibid.*]? Who does he mean? Are the 22 million disenfranchised majority inhabitants of South Africa included in that term? If so, why are they denied their rights in their homeland?

135. I must, however, concede the truth of one phrase in the opening remarks of the Pretoria representative, when he referred to the people of Angola who "fought on alone against foreign interventionists" [*ibid.*]. Yes, the courageous FAPLA, the Angolan armed forces, supported by the Angolan people, have fought on alone against the foreign racist interventionists from South Africa intervening on behalf of their protégés. We heard the representative of racist South Africa refer to the racist régime's "regional responsibilities" [*ibid., para. 29*]. Indeed, it is responsible as a regional policeman of Western imperialism; it is responsible for its *apartheid* policies and structures; it is responsible for creating and maintaining State terrorism. His reference to the racist régime's "responsibilities for the security of its own people" [*ibid.*] is such an apt phrase, for the elitist white minority's security and privilege are built upon the oppression and the blood of the majority. And, of course, "the security of the people of . . . Namibia" refers to turning Namibia into a garrison State, illegally occupied and its people enslaved by the racist rulers.

136. The Council has recently held a debate at the request of Tunisia. On behalf of my delegation, I should like to extend sympathy to my Tunisian colleague and, through him, to his Government and to the victims of that air massacre. My delegation cannot help speculating about the specific and general similarities in the two cases: in each case, a racist attacker whose Government rests on the principles of racism and racial discrimination; in each case, a régime which justifies its acts on ideological grounds. In each case, the régime is in illegal occupation of territory; in each case, the régime is the military Power in the area; in each case, the régime is guilty of violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighbouring and not-so-neighbouring States; in each case, many of its citizens are disenfranchised and treated as second-class citizens; in each case, the régime practises a form of settler colonialism; in each case, the régime has put thousands of patriots into prison or sent them into exile; in each case, the régime bases itself on so-called God-given dispensation; in each case, the régime is made up mainly of European settlers and their descendants; in each case, the régime has virtually an identical list of enemies and friends; in each case, the régime enjoys the support of the same very powerful patrons; in each case, the régime is the regional policeman for a distant imperialist Power; in each case, the régime pays lip-service to a political solution but simultaneously undertakes terrorist military action to sabotage those efforts.

137. Whether now or in the near future or in some distant future, the situation will and must change. Article 35 of the Charter states that any Member of the United Nations may bring any dispute, or any situation of the nature referred to in Article 34, to the attention of the

Security Council or of the General Assembly. Article 34 states:

> "The Security Council may investigate any dispute, or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security."

138. I beg the Council's pardon for reading out the Charter, but obviously the racist Pretoria régime and its representatives seem not to have read it. On the basis of the statement made a few days ago by the representative of the racist Pretoria régime and the ridiculous document circulated by him, it seems that they are unaware that what the Council is charged with are issues affecting international peace and security and not domestic and national issues, which neither concern nor affect nor involve anyone outside the borders of Angola. What is under discussion is the question of South African aggression against Angola and not any other matter.

139. The current international vendetta against South Africa referred to by the representative of the *apartheid* system has its genesis solely in the activities of the *apartheid* régime inside and outside South Africa. And this, may I remind that representative, is but the beginning of the end.

140. The racist leader's assurance quoted by the South African representative regarding the containment of South African forces inside South Africa is analogous to Hitler saying to the Jews "Trust me, trust me."

141. The struggle continues. Victory is certain.

142. The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.

NOTE

[1] A/AC.131/PV.446, p. 52.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-61439—March 1995—1,925